



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/630,507	07/28/2003	Tai-Ming Chen	Chen. T-01	7904
22197	7590	09/09/2005	EXAMINER	
GENE SCOTT; PATENT LAW & VENTURE GROUP 3140 RED HILL AVENUE SUITE 150 COSTA MESA, CA 92626-3440			ELLIS, KEVIN L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2188	

DATE MAILED: 09/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/630,507

Applicant(s)

CHEN, TAI-MING

Examiner

Kevin L. Ellis

Art Unit

2188

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/7/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

Detailed Action

1. Claims 1-11 are presented for examination.
2. Information disclosed and listed on PTO 1449 has been considered.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

3. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites:

- A) "if a memory section is written" (Line 2) is vague. It is suggested that the language be changed to "if a memory section has been written to".
- B) "allocating the memory section to memory function" (Line 3) is vague. It is suggested that the language be changed to "allocating the memory section to be used for normal memory functions".
- C) "verifying device identification" (Line 3) is vague and indefinite. How is the device identification verified? Where is the device identification located?
- D) "the memory section is not written" (Line 4) This should be changed similarly as stated above, "the memory section has not been written to".
- E) "if no match is found" (Line 4) is vague and indefinite. The claim is not clear in what values are being compared to determine if a match has occurred.

- F) "repeat read to set an increment input key" (Lines 4-5) is vague and indefinite. What is being "repeat read"? This is also written as if there has been a previous read, yet not other read is stated before in the claim.
- G) "the key" (Line 5) should be changed to "the incremental input key" for proper antecedent basis.
- H) "verify authentication return keys" (Lines 5-6) is vague and indefinite. Are the authentication return keys computed by some means? Or are they stored some place and read from there? And what are they being verified against?
- I) "and if the verify fails, halt the system; and continue to bring the computer system out of reset" (Lines 6-7) is vague and indefinite. The claim reads as if the system is being halted and brought out of reset at the same time.

Claims 2-11 have similar problems in being vague and indefinite. In general the claims are confusing to read and do not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the claimed invention. The claims should be rewritten so one can clearly determine the steps being performed and the metes and bounds of the claimed invention. Because of this it is difficult for the Examiner to perform an adequate prior art search on the claimed invention.

Conclusion

- 4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2188

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin L. Ellis whose telephone number is 571-272-4205. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays from 6:00AM-2:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mano Padmanabhan can be reached on 571-272-4210. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Kevin L. Ellis
Primary Examiner
September 4, 2005

Kevin L. Ellis